ey;" this certainly is but a very weak argument against our Order; a candid man, or one not predetermined to envenom the dart he meant to throw at an object, would rather have supposed, that as the members of our fraternity are in every part of the world so unerous, the greatest number of the persons who had usurped a power of governing France, being themselves masons, and well acquainted with the salutary influence of a plan which excluded all political discussion, and only tended to succour distress, and enforce the moral duties, might very naturally be led to countenance so numerous a body of the community, who by their indispensible tenets were prevented (as a body) from meddling with the springs of Government. But I. M. was, it is very manifest, pre-determined to view every object through an inverted medium.

His details of "horrible ceremonies, imaginary combats, Rabinical tales, &c. &c. I cannot speak to, as I have no knowledge of any thing to which they can allude; to contend with him on this subject, is a coimacky for which I have no inclination; nor is it necessary, as his introduction, just afterwards proves that he is stumbling among the tracks of impostures, among fanciful establishments which have no analogy to, and which derive neither

support nor countenance from, genuine Masoury.

The forced and affected complanent that I. M. then pays to "many Masons of this country of approved morality and sentiment," but ill comport with the jaundiced aspect of the foregoing part of the essay; as to the second, it is difficult for us to say what irregularity some Lodges (if Lodges) in France may have been guilty of: as to the third, wherein he is pleased to give us Socious for the founder of our order\*, and England as the place of its origin, and to compliment the Breth en of this nation as the exporters of its supposed irreligious and republical principles into France, I shall leave the task of reply to some other writer. For my part, I am heartily tired of the subject, ashamed of having entered so much at length upon it, and by no mea s convinced, that either the book in question is not suppositious, or that I. M. is not himself the author of it.

<sup>\*</sup> Faustus Socinus, it is to be observed, was born 1539, and died 1604, now a record in the reign of Edward IV. (about 1460,) in the Bodleian library, says, \*The charges and laws of the Free-masons have been seen and perused by our late Sovereign King Henry VI, and by the lords of his most honourable Council, who have allowed them, and declared that they be right, good, and reasonable to be holden, as they have been drawn out and collected from the records of ancient times, &c. &c.